DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 264 200 SP 026 767

AUTHOR Wood, Robert W.
TITLE The Bush Foundation and the University of South Dakota: A Case Study of Public and Private Sector Collaboration in Faculty Development.
PUB DATE Jul 85
NOTE 16p.; Paper presented at the World Assembly of the International Council on Education for Teaching (32nd, Vancouver, British Columbia, Canada, July 22-26, 1985).
PUB TYPE Speeches/Conference Papers (150) -- Reports - Descriptive (141)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Faculty Development; Grantsmanship; Higher Education; *Philanthropic Foundations; *Private Financial Support; Proposal Writing
IDENTIFIERS *Bush Foundation; University of South Dakota

ABSTRACT

The Bush Foundation Program at the University of South Dakota supports faculty development activities which have as their goal the improvement of undergraduate learning. The program is designed to address the university's special concerns with respect to faculty development including the diversity of its mission, its small size, and the remote location of its campus. Any faculty member of the university directly involved in undergraduate teaching is eligible to participate by presenting a proposal for faculty development in one of four categories: educational experiences, research activities, curriculum improvement activities, and symposia. The program provides mini-grants to individual faculty members, symposia featuring visiting scholars, and release time for curricular revisions. A description is offered of the university's three year collaboration with the Bush Foundation, and examples are given of the types of activities with which faculty members have been involved. The paper also describes steps in preparing the original proposal, administration and operation of the program, and evaluation procedures and results. (CB)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED264200

THE BUSH FOUNDATION AND THE UNIVERSITY OF SOUTH DAKOTA: A CASE STUDY OF PUBLIC AND PRIVATE SECTOR COLLABORATION IN FACULTY DEVELOPMENT

Robert W. Wood
Professor of Curriculum and Instruction
School of Education
The University of South Dakota
Vermillion, SD 57069

International Council on Education for Teaching
World Assembly
Vancouver, British Columbia
July 1985

SP 026 767

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

H. Leavitt

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

Established at Vermillion by Dakota Territorial Legislation in 1862, The University of South Dakota began classes in 1882. From a handful of students, the University has grown to more than five thousand students in its two colleges and six schools. The basic academic unit of the University is the College of Arts and Sciences with Schools of Law (1901), Medicine (1907), Education (1927), Business (1927), and the Graduate School, together with the College of Fine Arts (1931) and the School of Nursing (1954). The degrees offered range from the two-year Associate to the Doctorate of Philosophy and Doctor of Education.

Need for Faculty Development

The University of South Dakota is the comprehensive state university for South Dakota. The faculty is small with 254 full-time undergraduate faculty members, and a total of 344 full and part-time undergraduate faculty. The faculty is small relative to the 100 major fields of study offered.

University faculty members are typically middle-aged and received their terminal degrees several years ago:

University Faculty: Ages*

Undergraduate faculty aged 60 or above	27
Undergraduate faculty aged 50-59	82
Undergraduate faculty aged 40-49	122
Undergraduate faculty aged 30-39	85
Undergraduate faculty aged 23-29	19
Undergraduate faculty no ages available	9
	344

Undergraduate Faculty: Years in which degrees were earned*

Undergraduate faculty earning terminal degrees 1978-82	44
Undergraduate faculty earning terminal degrees 1973-77	57
Undergraduate faculty earning terminal degrees 1968-72	62
Undergraduate faculty earning terminal degrees 1963-67	25
Undergraduate faculty earning terminal degrees 1958-62	22
Undergraduate faculty earning terminal degrees 1953-57	13
Undergraduate faculty earning terminal degrees 1948-52	1
Undergraduate faculty earning terminal degrees 1943-47	2
	226

*In 1982 at time of preparation of Bush Foundation proposal

There has been low faculty member turnover at the University ranging from 6 to 19 new faculty hired each year since 1978. Low turnover and budgetary restrictions have resulted in the hiring of few new faculty members.

With few new faculty members being hired it is difficult to bring new thoughts to the campus unless the University embarks upon a faculty development plan to upgrade present faculty by providing opportunities to travel overseas, visit major libraries and other universities, attend conferences and bring back to the University newly gained knowledge and skills.

Research is another method to upgrade faculty and to explore new teaching methods. Despite the recognized need for faculty research little money has been available at the University.

Year	Research Funds Appropriated
1978-79	$ 2,500.00
1979-80	$ 2,500.00
1980-81	$14,500.00
1981-82	$14,500.00
1982-83	$31,774.00

Sabbatical leaves and travel monies are also limited at The University of South Dakota. The University administration recognizes the shortcomings and in principle supports faculty development but is unable to

to contribute additional financial resources.

In 1982, Joseph McFadden, President of The University of South Dakota, contacted Bush Foundation officers in St. Paul, Minnesota to determine the feasibility of a collaborative effort to enhance faculty development at The University of South Dakota. The Bush Foundation invited The University of South Dakota to submit a proposal for possible funding to support faculty development.

The Bush Foundation

The Bush Foundation was established in 1953 by Mr. and Mrs. Archibald Granvill Bush to support charitable, scientific, literary and educational activities. The Bush Foundation is active mainly in Minnesota, North Dakota and South Dakota and nearly one-half of its grant appropriation go to assist education.

The Faculty Development Program Grants

In 1979 The Bush Foundation began a "program to improve college student learning through faculty development and improvement of teaching." This program is limited to four-year, North Central accredited colleges and universities in Minnesota, North Dakota and South Dakota, and its main emphasis is the improvement of undergraduate learning.

Proposal for Faculty Development to The Bush Foundation

A faculty committee was established by the Faculty/Staff Development Sub-Committee, a standing committee of the University, to write the proposal for submission to The Bush Foundation. Twelve members served on the committee. The proposal was submitted in Spring 1983. Notification was received in early Summer 1983 that The University of South Dakota was awarded a three year, $280,980 grant for faculty development.

The University of South Dakota Program

The Bush Grant provides approximately $85,000 each year over a three year period to support faculty development projects under four categories: educational experiences, research activities, curricular revision, and symposia. Individual projects are funded to a maximum of $5000.00 while the curricular and symposium projects at a level of up to $10,000 each. Proposals from individual faculty members or collaborating groups of faculty members can be submitted for any of the aforementioned categories. Any faculty member who has responsibility within the undergraduate programs is eligible to apply for a grant award.

Each submitted proposal is evaluated according to certain common criteria. Foremost is that the proposed activity adds new knowledge or skills of the faculty member for transfer to undergraduate students or other faculty members. Other criteria are the depth of effect on the University, longevity of the effect, and the need of the faculty member making the request.

Descriptions of the four faculty development categories follows.

I. Educational Experiences

Faculty members are encouraged to attempt a variety of educational experiences such as attendance at workshops or short courses; exchange programs with other colleges and universities regionally, nationally and internationally; and programs connected with business, industry or government. Travel, release time (when appropriate) and/or tuition may be provided for attendance at workshop or short courses. Dissemination of the knowledge and skills acquired as a result of the educational experience is essential. Methods of dissemination would be presentations, mini-courses, performances, or other appropriate activities.

The focus of the educational experiences is the rejuvenation of the individual faculty member rather than a provision for the completion of appropriate degrees. The educational experience must substantially affect undergraduate teaching.

II. Research Activities

Proposals requesting funding related to research are accepted for such activities as: travel to libraries, laboratories, federal or state agencies and travel associated with field work; release time during the academic year for the purpose of conducting research; undergraduate stipends, limited clerical costs; and supplies.

The research activities must show a clear relationship to improvements in undergraduate learning. This relationship can be met by direct involvement of undergraduates in the actual research itself or in the part of the project involving dissemination of the knowledge in various undergraduate courses.

III. Improvement of Curricular Programs

A department, division or discipline may propose to improve curricular programs through reorganization of the curriculum of a particular discipline, or department, or to initiate new curricular programs. Funding for release time may be approved to allow faculty members an opportunity to develop and implement curricular changes. Interdisciplinary or cooperative efforts is encouraged.

IV. Symposia

Proposals may be submitted requesting funds for symposia that would be of interest to a substantial portion of the University community and would aid in the development of the undergraduate teaching faculty. Symposia could involve bringing prominent figures

to the University for activities open to the whole University community and classroom activities as well. The symposia would be directly linked to the improvement of undergraduate education.

The following are selected types of proposals that were funded under each of the four major faculty development categories:

I. Educational Experience

"Flute Masterclass at University of Maryland"

"Rejuvenating the Conductor"

"Chataqua Short Course in Organometallic Chemistry"

"Trip to the Hawaiian Volcano Observatory and Nearby Active Volcanos"

"One Year Teaching Position at University of Oldenburg, Germany"

"International Business and Economics Tour"

"American Accounting Association Midwest Workshops and Meetings"

"Computerized Videotape Editing Professional Training Course"

"Attendance at the Bradley University 1985 Berlin Seminar"

"Studying Contemporary Literature in Ireland"

"Workshop Strategies in Clinical Instruction"

"Microcomputers in Special Education"

"The International Phonetic Alphabet and the Singer"

"Pediatric Primary Care Conference"

"Workshop in Pre-Legal Writing"

"Science Education Update"

"Minnesota Opera Institute"

During the first two years of the Bush grant 52 projects have been funded in the educational experience category.

II. Research

"Sentencing Disparity of Native American and White Offenders in South Dakota"

"Reading and Editing the Notebooks of Meridel LeSueur"

"Role of Lutropin Microheterogeneity"

"Kinsey Institute Summer Study Project"

"Regal and Republican Roman Archaeology"

"Research for Fiction"

"Printing History of Marston's The Malcontent"

"Hostage Decompression and Treatment Study"

"Health Care Management Simulation Program"

"Writing, Developing, and Producing a New, Full-Length Play"

"The Vegetation of the Mountains of Colorado and Plateaus of Utah"

"An Examination of the Operation, Function, and Informational Materials of the Office of Public Information of the U.S. Department of Labor, Washington, D.C."

"Laboratory Data Collection with an IBM PC"

"Revision and Expansion of the Textbook Titled Logas: An Introduction to Logical Analysis"

Twenty two research projects have been funded.

III. Curriculum Improvement

"Integrate Structured Design into CSCI Core Courses"

"Microcomputer Applications in Teacher Education"

"Investigation and Utilization of the Computerized Teaching System in Pharmacology"

"Exploring CAI in Freshman Composition, Literature, and Grammar"

"Defining Role and Competencies for the Associate Degree Nurse"

Six curriculum improvement projects have been funded during the first two years of the Bush Grant.

IV. Symposia

"Computer Art Symposium"

"The Writer's Natural Resources"

"The Arts and the University Community"

"Quality of Life Through Wellness"

"In the Middle: Three Poets and a Publisher"

"Realizing the Potential of Undergraduate Education: Effecting a Positive Change"

Six symposia have been funded through this grant.

Table I shows how the Bush awards were distributed by department and college/school. All major undergraduate units in the University shared in the Bush awards.

Administration of the Bush Grant

Administration and operation of the Bush Grant is carried out by a Committee of Trustees, the Vice-President for Academic Affairs, and a Project Evaluator.

The Committee of Trustees administers the project following the original proposal submitted to the Bush Foundation establishing the guidelines by which individual proposals will be written and submitted. The Committee makes the call for proposals, accepts the proposals and evaluates them in accordance with the criteria stated earlier in this case study. The Committee also selects those proposals for funding and notifies the writers.

The Trustees are seven tenured faculty members actively engaged

TABLE I

BUSH AWARDS BY DEPARTMENT AND COLLEGE/SCHOOL

October 1983-March 1985

COLLEGE/SCHOOL	EDUCATIONAL EXPERIENCE	RESEARCH ACTIVITIES	CURRICULUM IMPROVEMENT	SYMPOSIA	TOTAL PROJECTS
Biology	6	1			7
Chemistry	3	1	1		5
Classics	1	1			2
Communications	1				1
Computer Science			1		1
Earth Science/Physics	1				1
English	3	5	1	2	11
Modern Languages	2				2
Nursing	2		2		4
Philosophy	1	1			2
Political Science/ Criminal Justice	4	2			6
Psychology	1	1			2
Social Behavior	1	1			2
ARTS & SCIENCES TOTAL	26	13	5	2	46
Art				2	2
Theatre	2	1			3
Music	11	1			12
Mass Communications	1	2			3
FINE ARTS TOTAL	14	4		2	20
MEDICINE TOTAL	2	3			5
EDUCATION TOTAL	4	1*	1	2	8
BUSINESS TOTAL	4				4
LIBRARY TOTAL	2				2
SHRINE TO MUSIC TOTAL	1				1
COLLEGE/SCHOOL TOTAL	52	22	6	6	86

*Submitted under the Research Activities category but funded as a Special Project

in teaching undergraduates. The Committee will include one member from each of the three divisions of the College of Arts and Sciences and one member each from the School of Education, School of Business, College of Fine Arts, and the area of undergraduate health education. The Trustees are elected by the faculty of their respective units. During the first year of operation four members were elected for two-year terms and three were elected for one-year terms. During the second and third year of the project, members were elected for one-year terms with re-election permitted. The Committee of Trustees reports directly to the Vice-President for Academic Affairs, who acts as Project Director and provides secretarial and clerical support for the Committee.

The Project Director is responsible for overall project management. He maintains fiscal control of the project, facilitates project objectives, and meets with the Committee of Trustees, advises them, and participates in their deliberations. He is, though, a non-voting member of the Committee of Trustees. The Project Director directly supervises the Project Evaluator and is responsible for the preparation of the annual report to the Bush Foundation. Dr. Arlen Gullickson, School of Education, a professionally trained evaluator was selected by the Trustees and the Project Director to coordinate the evaluative effort.

The initial elections for the Committee of Trustees were held in the respective units prior to September 1, 1983. Vice-President for Academic Affairs, Richard Butwell, convened the first meeting of the Trustees on September 15, 1983 at which time a chair was elected for the Committee. Immediately work commenced on the formulation of guidelines for proposal preparation. These guidelines were finalized and disseminated to all undergraduate faculty during late September, 1983.

The first funding cycle proposals' deadline was October 15, 1983 for projects pertaining to Spring Semester 1984. Deadline for proposals pertaining to Summer Session 1984 was January 15, 1984 and the deadline for proposals pertainjng to Fall Semester 1984 was March 15, 1984. Similar deadlines for the various funding cycles were followed during the 1984-85 academic year. During the final year of the three year project the funding cycles will be adjusted to bring closure to the project.

Proposals are accepted by the Committee of Trustees from any University faculty member who has substantial undergraduate teaching responsibilities. The specific format to be followed in writing the proposal, stated earlier in the paper, is developed by the Committee. Proposals are limited to ten (10) pages so as not to place an undue burden upon the Committee during the evaluation phase. Evaluation of the proposals is the responsibility of the Committee and follows the criteria stated earlier in this paper.

Summary of Evaluation

Evaluation is an essential component of the Bush Grant. It is an ongoing process during the three-year project with the Project Evaluator assigned the formal responsiblity for conducting evaluative efforts. Both formative and summative evaluation processes are involved in the Bush Grant. Formative evaluation activities have included preparing measurement instruments for use by the Trustees; consultation with faculty members in the preparation of project proposals to monitor and facilitate faculty in their conduct of funded projects. The intent of the summative evaluation has been to assess the impact of the project on faculty and undergraduates. The Project Evaluator submits an annual

comprehensive report of overall program progress to the Project Director.

Based on a general faculty survey, faculty members have been kept informed about the project. Most of the faculty surveyed rated the project highly for its dissemination of information and guidelines and reported the guidelines to be clear and informative. It appears that the faculty is satisfied with project progress.

Those faculty members who submitted proposals for possible funding were sent questionnaires to elicit their responses. Those faculty who were funded as well as not funded perceived the Bush grant as having a positive impact on the University. However, some not funded gave the project a low rating on fairness in the evaluation process of the proposals.

The Project Evaluator believes the surveys provided support for the project. While not all persons were totally satisfied with the project, there were no areas where dissatisfaction was consistently noted by those surveyed.

The Project Evaluator interviewed the Board of Trustees members. Not surprisingly, the Trustees were very supportive of the Bush Grant and believe the project is functioning well.

It is the Project Evaluator's perception that the project is functioning well and is being administered in an effective manner. Only minor modifications have been made in the project.

Conclusions

The last two years have been the most dynamic period in the area of faculty development in the history of The University of South Dakota. Because of public and private sector collaboration, The University of South Dakota and The Bush Foundation, faculty members are having

opportunities to pursue faculty development projects that will enhance their knowledge and skills which can then be transferred to other faculty and undergraduate students.

It is the intent of the administration at the University to increase faculty development monies in the areas of travel, research projects and special mini-projects. Receipt of support from the Bush Foundation has allowed the University to plan budget adjustments so that beginning with the 1986-87 academic year the University will be able to commit an additional $100,000 to support faculty development activities. At the end of the Bush project, the University will be able to assume total responsibility for faculty development activities.

Under the direction of President Joseph McFadden, The University of South Dakota, with the support of The Bush Foundation, is establishing a diverse faculty development program effort. President McFadden has made professional growth and development one of his major areas of emphasis since assuming the Presidency of The University of South Dakota on June 1, 1982.

It is highly doubtful that even 10% of the Bush Grant faculty development projects could have been accomplished without the support from the Bush Foundation. Bush Foundation collaboration with The University of South Dakota has had an extraordinary positive effect upon faculty and students alike.

References

USD Faculty (1982). Proposal for Faculty Development to the Bush Foundation from The University of South Dakota. Proposal submitted to the Bush Foundation.

Butwell, R. (1984). Report on the First Year of the Bush Grant Awards. A report submitted to President Joseph McFadden and the Bush Foundation Grant Board of Trustees.